REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The action by the Examiner of this application, together with the cited references, have been given careful consideration. Following such consideration, claims 1 and 19 have been amended to define more clearly the patentable invention the Applicant believes is disclosed herein. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the claims in their present form, together with the following comments, and allow the application.

The claimed computer includes a case in which a cooling device and an electrical component to be cooled are arranged. The case has a ventilation opening. The ventilation opening is arranged on a side of the case opposite to the electrical component. The ventilation opening is disposed in a region of the case that is offset towards an opposite side of the case. In other words, the claimed ventilation opening is recessed in one side wall of the case such that the ventilation opening is closer to the electrical component to be cooled relative to conventional ventilation openings. The cooling device is arranged between the ventilation opening and the electrical component. An unobstructed space is defined between the ventilation opening and the cooling device. In this regard, a substantially rectilinear and unobstructed air flow onto the component can be formed inside the case. When compared to conventional computers, the claimed structure allows for a shortened, unobstructed rectilinear air flow to be formed within the case.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references teaches, suggests, or shows a computer as presently set forth in the claims or the advantages thereof. In response to the Examiner's rejections, claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1 and 19 now recite that an

"unobstructed" space is defined between the ventilation opening and the cooling device. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that a "ventilation opening (4) is disposed in a region *of a sidewall* of the case and said region of said sidewall is offset towards said electrical component (1)." Claim 19 has been further amended to recite "said ventilation opening (4) is recessed in a side wall of said one side of said case towards said electrical component (1) on an opposite side of the case."

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,242 B2 to Ogawa. The Ogawa reference teaches a computer having a case that has a plurality of ventilation openings formed therein. The ventilation openings are not disposed in a region of the case that is offset toward an electrical component on an opposite side of the case.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Ogawa reference does not teach, suggest, or show a ventilation opening disposed in a region of a sidewall where the region is offset towards an opposite side of the case as is claimed. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Because claims 3-18 depend from claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that they too are in condition for allowance.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,219,235 to Diaz et al. The Diaz et al. reference discloses a rack for supporting an electronic assembly. A front panel disposed adjacent to the electronic assembly includes air flow apertures. A second set of apertures defined on a front chassis surface is disposed in a space between the first set of apertures and a device to be cooled. In other words,

the second set of apertures is an obstruction disposed in the space defined between the first set of apertures and the device to be cooled.

Thus, the Diaz reference does not teach, suggest, or show an "*unobstructed* space" defined between a ventilation opening and a cooling device as required by claim 19. Likewise, a combination of the Ogawa and Diaz et al. references would not teach, suggest, or show a ventilation opening "recessed in a sidewall" of one side of a case towards an electrical component on an opposite side of the case.

To summarize, the claimed invention provides a shortened, unobstructed space being defined between a ventilation opening and a cooling device. In contrast, a combination of the Ogawa reference and the Diaz et al. reference would result in a obstructed space between a ventilation opening and a device to be cooled.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended above, do not present new matter and do not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has also been reviewed. It is respectfully submitted that none of these additional references teaches, suggests, or shows the Applicant's invention as defined by the present claims. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes there are any further matters that need to be discussed in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0537, referencing our Docket No. BE8794US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **March 17, 2006**

Mark Kusner, Reg. No. 31,115

KUSNER & JAFFE
Highland Place – Suite 310
6151 Wilson Mills Road
Highland Heights, Ohio 44143
(440) 684-1090 (phone)
(440) 684-1095 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referenced as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited on the below date with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: **March 17, 2006**

Laura K. Cahill